



Space and Naval Warfare Systems Center Atlantic

Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS)

**SSC Atlantic Small
Business and Industry
Outreach Initiative**
Thirty-ninth Symposium
17 March 2016

John R. OConnor
Contracting Officer's Representative
(COR) Program Manager

Agenda

- ▼ CPARS Basics
- ▼ Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)
- ▼ Evaluation Ratings
- ▼ CPARS Draft Approval Document (CDAD)
- ▼ Myths Versus Facts
- ▼ CPARS Narrative Writing Issues / Examples
- ▼ QASP – CDAD – CPARS
- ▼ Key CPARS Timeframes
- ▼ Takeaways

CPARS Basics

▼ Applicability

- Acquisitions \geq \$1 Million - primarily task / delivery orders and C-type contracts (no longer applicable at the ID/IQ basic contract level).

▼ Government Players

- Assessing Official's Representative (AOR) – COR
- Assessing Official (AO) – IPT Lead
- CPARS Focal Point – LaVerne Brown

▼ Reporting Frequency

- The entire CPARS process MUST be complete within 120 days of evaluation period ending.

▼ Key to Success

- Continuous and effective communication

Quality Assurance Surveillance Plan (QASP)

SPAWARSYSCEN ATLANTIC STANDARD QUALITY ASSURANCE SURVEILLANCE PLAN (QASP)

CONTRACT NUMBER		DELIVERY ORDER/TASK ORDER NUMBER (DO/TO)		CONTRACTOR NAME		DATE	
STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES (SOO)/PERFORMANCE WORK STATEMENT (PWS) SHORT TITLE				CONTRACTING OFFICER REPRESENTATIVE (COR) NAME (Last, First, MI)			
QUALITY OF PRODUCT #1/CONTRACT DATA REQUIREMENTS LIST (CDRL) DOCUMENTS CDRL documents (data deliverables) weights vary depending on the value to the government. If CPARS Draft Approval Document (CDAD) CDRL exists in the basic contract, it must be included in the task order and in the QASP. Note: Total weight points must equal 100 per page.				OBJECTIVES - ACCEPTABLE QUALITY LEVEL (AQL) CDRL documents that are complete; have no flawed information, analyses, assumptions or conclusions; and have a minimum number of minor grammatical errors (i.e., errors in less than 10% of the pages).			
REMEDY IF AQL IS NOT MET							

CPARS GROUP	CDRL #	DESCRIPTION	FREQUENCY	WEIGHT	METHOD OF SURVEILLANCE	UNSATISFACTORY 1	MARGINAL 2	SATISFACTORY 3	VERY GOOD 4	EXCEPTIONAL 5
Quality of Product #1					100% Review by COR	Total weight of Documents that comply with AQL is	Total weight of Documents that comply with AQL is	Total weight of Documents that comply with AQL is	Total weight of Documents that comply with AQL is	Total weight of Documents that comply with AQL is
					COR will review within 15 working days of receipt and log results of all reviews (i.e. CDRL Documents accepted and if rejected, reason for rejection).	less than 75%	76 -89%	90-100%	100%	100%
						Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner.	Performance does not meet some contractual requirements	Performance meets contractual requirements.	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit	Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many, to the government's benefit
						Contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.	Contractual performance reflects a serious problem for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective action.	To justify a Satisfactory rating, only minor problems should exist, or major problems the contractor recovered from without a negative effect on the contract. Also, no significant weaknesses should have been identified.	To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the government. Also, no significant weaknesses should have been identified.	To justify an Exceptional rating, identify significant events
		Total								

Evaluation Ratings

▼ Satisfactory – (3)

- Performance meets contractual requirements. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor appear or were satisfactory.
- To justify a Satisfactory rating, there should have been only minor problems, or major problems the contractor recovered from without impact to the contract/order. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified. A fundamental principle of assigning ratings is that contractors will not be evaluated with a rating lower than Satisfactory solely for not performing beyond the requirements of the contract/order.

Evaluation Ratings

▼ Very Good - (4)

- Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds some to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with some minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were effective.
- To justify a Very Good rating, identify a significant event and state how it was a benefit to the Government. There should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.

Evaluation Ratings

▼ Exceptional - (5)

- Performance meets contractual requirements and exceeds many to the Government's benefit. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated was accomplished with few minor problems for which corrective actions taken by the contractor were highly effective.
- To justify an Exceptional rating, identify multiple significant events and state how they were of benefit to the Government. A singular benefit, however, could be of such magnitude that it alone constitutes an Exceptional rating. Also, there should have been NO significant weaknesses identified.

Evaluation Ratings

▼ Marginal – (2)

- Performance **does not meet some contractual requirements**. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element being evaluated reflects **a serious problem** for which the contractor has not yet identified corrective actions. The contractor's proposed actions appear only marginally effective or were not fully implemented.
- To justify a Marginal performance, **identify a significant event** in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how it **impacted the Government**. A Marginal rating should be supported by referencing the management tool that notified the contractor of the contractual deficiency (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).

Evaluation Ratings

▼ Unsatisfactory – (1)

- Performance does not meet most contractual requirements and recovery is not likely in a timely manner. The contractual performance of the element or sub-element contains a serious problem(s) for which the contractor's corrective actions appear or were ineffective.
- To justify an Unsatisfactory rating, identify multiple significant events in each category that the contractor had trouble overcoming and state how they impacted the Government. A singular problem, however, could be of such serious magnitude that it alone constitutes an Unsatisfactory rating. An Unsatisfactory rating should be supported by referencing the management tool used to notify the contractor of the contractual deficiencies (e.g., management, quality, safety, or environmental deficiency report or letter).

CPARS Draft Approval Document (CDAD)

SPAWARSYSCEN ATLANTIC STANDARD MONTHLY CPARS DRAFT APPROVAL DOCUMENT (CDAD)							
CONTRACT NUMBER		DELIVERY ORDER/TASK ORDER NUMBER (DO/TO)			REPORTING MONTH		DATE
CPARS GROUP	TASK	MONTHLY CONTRACTOR INPUT			CALCULATED RATING	CONTRACTOR INPUT	COR INPUT
						RATIONALE	COMMENTS
Quality of Product or Service	Documents	Weight of Documents Due	Weight of AQL Documents Delivered	% Weight of AQL Compliant Documents		Comments	Comments
	Hardware Goods	Weight of Hardware Goods Due	Weight of AQL Hardware Goods Delivered	% Weight of AQL Compliant Hardware Goods			
	Installations and Equipment Removal (I/ER)	Weight of I/ER Due	Weight of AQL I/ER Delivered	% Weight of AQL Compliant I/ER			
	Software Development (SW Dev)	Weight of SW Dev Due	Weight of AQL SW Dev Delivered	% Weight of AQL Compliant SW Dev			
Schedule	Documents	Weight of Documents Scheduled	Weight of Documents Delivered on Time	% Weight of AQL Compliant Documents		Comments	Comments
	Milestone Schedule	Weight of Baseline (Master Plant) Milestone Scheduled Tasks	Weight of Milestone Tasks on Time	% Weight of AQL Compliant Tasks			
KO ADJUDICATION*							
*KO Adjudication only necessary if any proposed score is 2 or less.							
Important: CDADs are to be submitted on a monthly basis. "N/A" should be entered in the Proposed Rating section if not applicable. However, Cost Variance in the Cost Control Group must always have a rating (1-5) related to actual versus planned.							

CPARS Draft Approval Document (CDAD)

- ▼ The CDAD is incorporated into the QASP (Pages 9 & 10).
- ▼ When the Contracting Officer signs the QASP it locks but does not lock the CDAD.
- ▼ The QASP is utilized by the COR when monitoring and overseeing the Task Order.
- ▼ **The Contractor submits the CDAD monthly (if req. as a CDRL).**
- ▼ **The COR completes CDAD by providing an objective rating within 10 business days.**

Myths Versus Facts

- ▼ Contractors can never receive an evaluation rating higher than Satisfactory – (3).
- ▼ The Government will never give an evaluation rating higher than Satisfactory – (3).
- ▼ CORs are trained to only give an evaluation rating of Satisfactory – (3).

ALL THE ABOVE STATEMENTS ARE FALSE

FACT - NARRATIVES MUST MATCH RATINGS

CPARS Narrative Writing – Issues

Very Good	The systems installed performed as expected and the level of craftsmanship was exceptional in all areas, minus furniture systems. (QoP/S)
Very Good	Cost stayed with budget , no issues. (CC)
Exceptional	The quality of business relations was exceptional. We were always informed of any issues, requests for information or required changes to the design in a timely manner so that we could adjust and still make the deliverable dates . (BR)
Very Good	...monthly status reports and financial data were received free of errors ... The contractor also provided very good quality proposals that included minimal errors . (QoP/S)
Very Good	...status reports were delivered in a timely and professional manner. Project deliverables were delivered on time . (S)

CPARS Narrative Writing – Issues

Very Good	Contractor performed a satisfactory job with their cost control measures. (CC)
Very Good	...contractor has met all required deadlines ... (S)
Very Good	...contractor has continually met budgeted costs ... Contractor provided timely billings that were current, accurate and complete... (CC)
Very Good	...contractor has consistently been able to match the qualifications of required key positions... (MoKP)
Very Good	No significant errors were encountered during the PWS for the performance period (QoP/S).

CPARS Narrative Writing – Issues

Very Good	Met deliverable as defined in the PWS (S).
Very Good	Contractor matched personnel with appropriate skill sets in support of the tasking (MoKP).
Satisfactory	Contractor received Letter of Corrective Action for not having enough role players to accomplish the task per the PWS (QoP/S).
Very Good	Contractor maintained an appropriate workforce to meet dynamic demands of the customer (CC).
Very Good	Since contractor re-structured their management for the delivery order there has been a marked improvement in meeting the requirements in the task order (MoKP).

CPARS Narrative Writing – Example

Very Good

The Contractor successfully executed the system recovery, **exceeding requirements**. Deployments of new releases were on schedule for this period. Per the Continuity of Operations Plan (COOP), the contractor had a **7 day timeframe for full system restoration** after sustaining the attack. However, the Contractor was able to **recover and bring the system online within 4 days**, resulting in **cost and time benefits** for not having to manually track data during the downtime. This early recovery **eliminated a work stoppage on engine configuration management at the customer sites**. The Contractor **experienced a turnover** of the senior developer during the development phase of the first upgrade. However, due to **replacement with a highly skilled senior developer** who was able to program **more quickly and efficiently**, the Contractor was able to bring the final release deployment back on track with **no impact to the schedule** (S).

CPARS Narrative Writing – Example

Exceptional

The Contractor has provided exceptional quality in support of VFED. The contract required a system backup and disaster recovery plan that was put to the test after a malicious code/virus attack. The Contractor was **proactive with a successful recovery**, implemented an **innovative solution to prevent future attacks**, and **enhanced system security**. The Contractor also initiated a **system analysis identifying a security loophole** previously overlooked at the time of database development by the previous incumbent. The Contractor was able to recommend a **Commercial-Off-The-Shelf (COTS) product** to resolve security issues **saving custom development time and cost**. The Contractor staff assisted in conducting an analysis of alternatives, market research, and application acquisition package recommendations in finding the COTS bolt-on. The Contractor experienced report generation errors resulting in **unscheduled downtime** after a three week period, however, they **resolved** the performance issue by **scheduling report runtime during times of minimal system usage and optimized the reports to require less memory**.

QASP – CDAD – CPARS Process

- ▼ When properly accomplished on a monthly basis, generating the CPARS submission simply requires consolidation of the ratings and commentary captured on the monthly CDADs.
- ▼ CPARS Focal Point reviews all CPARS submissions verifying adequate narrative support for evaluation rating.
 - CPARS Focal Point and COR PM work with the AOR / AO when discrepancies are identified.
- ▼ This process has all but eliminated late CPARS submissions
 - 1,603 Active CPARS Assessments
 - 0 Delinquent CPARS Assessments

Key CPARS Timeframes

- ▼ All CPARS due 120 days after end of evaluation period
- ▼ Contractor has 60 days to respond after evaluation is sent
- ▼ Contractor has 7 days to request meeting to discuss CPARS
- ▼ 15 days after evaluation sent it becomes available in PPIRS
 - Note: Evaluation is marked as “Pending”
- ▼ At any time, if contractor provides comments the evaluation is returned to the AO and contractor cannot view again until closed
- ▼ If contractor provides comments, PPIRS updates the next day
 - Note: “Pending” marking will be removed once evaluation closed by AO
- ▼ After 60 days evaluation returns to AO for closing
 - Note: Contractor can no longer provide any comments
- ▼ If contractor comments do not concur closeout is by RO

3 Main Takeaways

- ▼ All evaluation ratings can be earned but **MUST** be supported with objective evidence in the CPARS narrative
- ▼ Understand the evaluation rating definitions and be realistic in your evaluation rating expectations
- ▼ Communicate – Communicate – Communicate